

DOCKET NO. 5244-0099-2X

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :  
TETSURO MOTOYAMA ET AL. : EXAMINER: NGUYEN, N.  
SERIAL NO: 09/393,677 :  
FILED: SEPTEMBER 10, 1999 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2179  
FOR: REMOTE SYSTEM USAGE :  
MONITORING WITH FLEXIBLE  
OBJECT

APPEAL BRIEF

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

Applicants appeal the rejection in the Office Action of March 25, 2005.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The present application is assigned to Ricoh Company, Ltd., having a place of business at 3-6 Nakamagome 1-chome, Ohta-ku, Tokyo 143-8555 Japan, and that party is the real party in interest in the present appeal.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellant, appellants' legal representatives, and the assignee note the present Appeal is related to the Appeal in co-pending U.S. application serial No. 09/440,692, by virtue of that Appeal and the present Appeal having similar issues and similar rejections over the same applied art.

### III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-25, and 27-32 are pending in this application, and each of claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-25, and 27-32 is on appeal. Claims 2, 10, 18, and 26 were canceled during prosecution.

### IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Filed concurrently with the present Appeal Brief is a Response to the Office Action of March 25, 2005, submitting a Terminal Disclaimer over U.S. application serial No. 09/440,692 to obviate the outstanding double patenting rejection in the Office Action. No amendments were submitted in that Response.

### V. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

The claimed invention is directed to a system, a method, and a computer program product that all operate to monitor usage of an interface of a device, the interface including a plurality of operations to be selected by a user, and that then send a log of monitored usage data to a destination.

More particularly, in the claimed invention, and with reference to Figures 9-11 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, a device 300 includes a user interface 510. Figures 10 and 11 show specific embodiments of user interfaces 600, 700, the embodiment of Figure 10 showing a monitor 600 of a workstation as a user interface and the embodiment of Figure 11 showing an operation panel 700 of an image forming device as a user interface. (See also the present specification at page 17, line 25, to page 19, line 2).

Further, in the claimed invention a monitoring is executed to monitor data of selecting of the plurality of operations of the interface by the user, and to generate a log of the monitored data in the device. (See for example the monitoring block 1200 in Figures 12A, 12B, which includes a logging operation 1315, and the corresponding discussion in the present specification at page 19, line 26 et. seq.). The log of the monitored data is in the form of an abstract class. (See for example the specification at page 29, line 9 et. seq.).

Further, a communicating device receives an object derived from the abstract class including the log of the monitored data. (See for example the sending block 1600 in Figures 12A, 12B and also Figure 17 in the present specification).

Further, the monitoring device automatically starts the monitoring without requiring a connection to a receiving device to which the log of monitored data is to be sent. (See for example the present specification at page 20, line 21 et. seq., and particularly page 20, lines 22-23 that state that Figure 13 shows that when a target application of a device starts up a startMonitoring function is called. As evident from that discussion in the present specification and from Figure 13 no connection to a receiving device to which the log of the monitored data is to be sent is needed to begin the monitoring operation).

Further, the communicating device automatically communicates the log of the monitored data by a unidirectional communication without requiring input from the device to which the message of the monitored data is to be sent. (That subject matter is evident from Figure 17 in the present specification showing the operation of the sending block 1600 and the corresponding description thereof in the present specification at page 26, line 24 et. seq. At that portion it is clear that the message of

the log of the monitored data is sent without requiring an input from the device to which the log of the monitored data is to be sent).

## VI. ISSUES

The first issue outstanding in the present application is whether claims 25 and 27-32 set forth statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

The second issue outstanding in the present application is whether each feature recited in claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-25, and 27-32 is fully met by the combination of teachings in U.S. patent 6,003,070 to Frantz in view of U.S. patent 6,163,802 to Lin et al. (herein "Lin") under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

## VII. ARGUMENT

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

The first issue in the present application is whether claims 25 and 27-32 set forth statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

The rejection to claims 25 and 27-32 as reciting non-statutory subject matter states:

The claims recite "a computer program product", which is defined in the specification on page 36 as being "any type of media suitable for storing electronic instructions", which could include intangible media such as signals, carrier waves, transmissions, optical waves, transmission media or other media incapable of being touched or perceived absent the tangible medium through which they are conveyed.

The above-noted rejection is traversed as claims 25 and 27-32 clearly set forth a tangible media.

First, the outstanding rejection has only apparently looked at the preamble of the noted claims and has not looked at the body of the noted claims. The first element in claim 25 is “a ***computer storage medium*** and a computer program code mechanism embedded in the computer storage medium...” (emphasis added). Clearly such a medium is a tangible medium capable of being touched.

Also, the basis for the rejection citing the specification at page 36 is not at all understood. First, the noted portion in the specification indicates a “media suitable for ***storing*** electronic instructions” (emphasis added). Such a ***storing media*** is clearly tangible.

Further, the statement in the Office Action that “such media could include intangible media such as signals, carrier waves, transmissions, optical waves, transmission media or other media incapable of being touched...” is unclear as such media clearly cannot ***store*** electronic instructions.

In such ways, claims 25 and 27-32 clearly recite statutory subject matter and are in full compliance with all requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Frantz in view of Lin**

**Independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 25**

The above-noted claims positively recite several features neither taught nor suggested by Frantz in view of Lin.

Each of independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25, and thereby the claims dependent therefrom, requires “a device comprising an interface, the interface comprising a plurality of operations to be selected by a user”.

Each of independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25, and thereby the claims dependent therefrom, also requires either a monitoring device or a monitoring operation to “automatically start the monitoring without requiring a connection to a receiving device to which the log of monitored data is to be sent”.

Each of independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25, and thereby the claims dependent therefrom, also requires either a communication device or a communication operation to “automatically communicate the log of the monitored data by a unidirectional communication without requiring input from the device to which the log of the monitored data is to be sent”

Such features positively recited in the claims set forth an operation and structure that clearly differs from the teachings in Frantz in view of Lin.

The claims as currently written are directed to a system, method, or computer program product that includes a device comprising an interface with a plurality of options to be selected by a user. The user’s selection of those pluralities of options is monitored, generated into a log, and stored, without an input from or connection to a device that ultimately will receive the log. A communicating device receives an object derived from the abstract class including the log of the monitored data, and communicates that message of the monitored data by a unidirectional communication without requiring input from a device to which the message of the log of the monitored data is to be sent. That is, in the claimed invention the destination device to which the log of the monitored data is to be sent does not need to establish a prior connection to the communicating device, nor does that destination device need to provide any instructions for authorization of the monitoring, generating, storing, or communicating operations.

Such features positively recited in the claims set forth an operation and structure that clearly differ from the teachings in Frantz in view of Lin.

Frantz, the primary cited reference in the new rejection, is not even similar to the claimed features. The outstanding rejection appears to cite the teachings in Frantz as Frantz utilizes an element with the same term “interface” as in the claimed features. However, the interface and the monitoring operation performed in Frantz differ completely from the claimed features.

As shown in Figure 1 Frantz discloses an interface device 10 that is placed between equipment 20, an ASCII terminal 18, and a line printer 19. That interface 10 in Frantz is a hardware interface and is in particular a smart internet interface for telephone switching equipment status reporting and control.<sup>1</sup> Frantz discloses that standard telephone switching equipment such as a private branch exchange (PBX) or an automatic call distributor (ACD) typically are equipped with two standard interfaces, one standard line printer interface, which can log error conditions and changes in status in configuration, and a second standard interface on most equipment is an ASCII dumb terminal interface to drive a VT 100 style dumb terminal that a technician can use to query an error buffer and also to make changes in the configuration of the system to take on line or off line certain functionalities in the switch.<sup>2</sup> Frantz recognizes that a problem with such standard equipment is that all the checking and testing must be done locally.<sup>3</sup>

However, Frantz differs fundamentally from the claimed features.

The claims are directed to a device in which an interface includes “a plurality of operations to be selected by a user”. A non-limiting example of such an interface

---

<sup>1</sup> Frantz at column 1, lines 5-7.

<sup>2</sup> Frantz at column 1, lines 9-20.

<sup>3</sup> Frantz column 1, lines 21-22.

may be an operation panel of an image forming device including several operations that can be selected by a user, operations such as "Print", "Copy", etc.

The interface 10 shown in Figure 1 in Frantz is not directed to such a type of interface. More particularly, that interface 10 does not have any operations selected by a user that are monitored.

In the claimed invention the user's selecting of the plurality of operations on the interface is monitored, e.g. it is monitored if a user presses a "Print" button on an interface of an image forming device interface in such a non-limiting example, and that monitored data of the user's selection of the operations on the interface is communicated.

The outstanding rejection does appear to make a reference to "activation criteria" in Frantz as corresponding to such operations that are monitored.<sup>4</sup> However, in that respect Frantz merely appears to indicate that activation criteria can indicate when information is to be communicated, and the "activation criteria" are not in fact user's selection of operations on the interface. More particularly, Frantz notes that

...the activation criteria can be set to an alert mode, wherein only emergency system messages, such as critical error messages would be sent. The activation criteria can be set to a maintenance/repair mode where every system message, including interrupts, register contents, memory mapping, memory contents, software descriptions, configuration settings, error log contents, and any other data useful information about the status of the equipment that would be used by a technician in repairing, updating, monitoring, or performing routine maintenance on the equipment is sent via E-mail.<sup>5</sup>

The claims clearly require different operations as in Frantz. In the claimed invention the user's actual selections of operations on the interface are monitored.

---

<sup>4</sup> Office Action of March 25, 2005, page 4, lines 6-7 of prenumbered paragraph 9.

<sup>5</sup> Frantz at column 5, lines 3-13.



That is simply not the case in Frantz. Frantz does not disclose any even similar operation.

Thereby, Frantz does not disclose or suggest the claimed “interface” and “monitoring” device positively recited in the claims.

Moreover, no teachings in Lin are cited with respect to the above-noted feature or can overcome the above-noted deficiencies in Frantz.

Thereby, each of the pending claims distinguishes over Frantz in view of Lin and the outstanding rejection based on Frantz in view of Lin must be reversed.

### **The Dependent Claims**

Moreover, the dependent claims recite further features neither taught nor suggested by Frantz in view of Lin in contrast to the positions stated in the March 25, 2005 Office Action.

### **Dependent Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 19, 20, 27, 28**

Dependent claims 3, 11, 19, and 27 further recite that the “target application is an image forming device and the interface is an operation panel of the image forming device”. Dependent claims 4, 12, 20, and 28 further recite that “the device is an appliance and the interface is an operation panel of the apparatus”. No combination of teachings of Frantz in view of Lin addresses the above-noted features.

The rejection to the above-noted claims relies upon Frantz to disclose the interface as an operation panel of an image forming device, and Frantz to also disclose the apparatus as directed to an operation panel of an appliance.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Office Action of March 15, 2005, page 5, lines 13-16.

In that respect applicants submit that reliance on the teaching of Frantz at column 2, lines 15-31 is misguided. At column 2, lines 5-31 Frantz provides examples of interface devices that also perform monitoring operations of the devices themselves. For example, Frantz discloses a photocopier that monitors the amount of toner and paper. In no respect does Frantz teach or suggest that the interface device monitors actual selections on the interface device by a user. In Frantz the noted photocopier only monitors the amount of toner and paper but does not at all monitor the user's selections of the graphical user interface of the photocopier, as an example. Thus, the reliance on the teachings in Frantz at column 2, lines 15-31 is misguided with respect to the claimed features set forth in the above-noted claims.

Thereby, dependent claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 19, 20, 27, and 28 further distinguish over the applied art.

**Dependent Claims 5, 13, 21, 29**

Dependent claims 5, 13, 21, and 29 further recite "the communicating device sends the log of the monitored data when the user exits the target application". That feature also distinguishes over Frantz in view of Lin.

The above-noted features is believed to clearly distinguish over Frantz, which is relied upon to teach that feature at column 4, lines 32-52.<sup>7</sup>

The Office Action cites Frantz at column 4, lines 32-52 to disclose sending the log of the monitored data when the user exits the device. That basis for the outstanding rejection is not understood as Frantz does not disclose or suggest any such features. As noted above, the claims are directed to a system that monitors how a user selects operations on an interface, and thus when the user exits the interface the

---

<sup>7</sup> Office Action of March 15, 2005, page 8, last two lines.

log of the monitored data is communicated. Frantz is not directed to a device that monitors how a user selects operations on an interface, and thus Frantz cannot teach or suggest sending such log data when the user exits the device. In Frantz the user is not exiting the device at all.

Thereby, dependent claims 5, 13, 21, and 29 further define over the applied art.

**Dependent Claims 6, 14, 22, 30**

Dependent claims 6, 14, 22, and 30 further recite “a setting unit configured to set a number of sessions of the target application to be executed by the user prior to the communicating device communicating the log file of the monitored data”.

With respect to the above-noted feature the Office Action cites item 25 in Frantz and the disclosure at column 4, line 56 to column 5, line 12.<sup>8</sup> However, that reliance on the teachings in Frantz is not at all understood. Frantz does not disclose or suggest any indication in which a number of sessions can be set of the target application being used by the user prior to communicating the device. None of the noted “activation criteria” in Frantz is directed to such a feature. Thus, the above-noted claims even further distinguish over the applied art.

Thereby, dependent claims 6, 14, 22, and 30 further distinguish over the applied art.

**Dependent Claims 7, 15, 23, 31**

Dependent claims 7, 15, 23, and 31 further recite the “abstract class includes first and second derived classes, the first derived class storing data of one session and the second derived class storing data of the set number of sessions”.

---

<sup>8</sup> Office Action of March 15, 2005, page 6, first paragraph.

To meet the above-noted limitations the outstanding rejection cites Lin at column 7, line 45 to column 8, line 25.<sup>9</sup> However, at that portion Lin does not meet the above-noted features. That is, Lin does not teach or suggest a first derived class storing data of one session and a second derived class storing data of a set number of sessions. The basis for the outstanding rejection has not even addressed such a feature in any detail and does not provide any indication of how Lin teaches such features.


Thereby, dependent claims 7, 15, 23, and 31 further distinguish over the applied art.

#### IX. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons each of claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-25, and 27-32 recites statutory subject matter and distinguishes over the teachings in Frantz in view of Lin, and thereby the outstanding rejections must be REVERSED.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

James J. Kulbaski  
Registration No. 34,648  
Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423  
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)  
JJK:SNS:smi

I:\ATTYSNS\5244\52440099\52440099-AB 5-10-05.doc

---

<sup>9</sup> Office Action of March 25, 2005, page 6, second paragraph.

APPENDIX

1. (Rejected) A system comprising:

a device comprising an interface, the interface comprising a plurality of operations to be selected by a user;

a monitoring unit configured to monitor data of selecting of the plurality of operations of the interface by the user, and to generate a log of the monitored data, the log of the monitored data being stored in the device, and to automatically start the monitoring without requiring a connection to a receiving device to which the log of monitored data is to be sent, the log of the monitored data being in a form of an abstract class;

a communicating unit configured to receive an object derived from the abstract class including the log of the monitored data, and to automatically communicate the log of the monitored data by a unidirectional communication without requiring input from the device to which the log of the monitored data is to be sent.

2. (Canceled).

3. (Rejected) A system according to Claim 1, wherein the device is an image forming device and the interface is an operation panel of the image forming device.

4. (Rejected) A system according to Claim 1, wherein the device is an appliance and the interface is an operation panel of the appliance.

5. (Rejected) A system according to Claim 1, wherein the communicating unit sends the log of the monitored data when the user exits the device.

6. (Rejected) A system according to Claim 1, further comprising a setting unit configured to set a number of sessions of the device to be executed by the user prior to the communicating unit communicating the log of the monitored data.

7. (Rejected) A system according to Claim 6, wherein the abstract class includes first and second derived classes, the first derived class storing data of one session and the second derived class storing data of the set number of sessions.

8. (Rejected) A system according to any one of Claims 1 and 3-7, wherein the communicating unit communicates the log of the monitored data by Internet mail.

9. (Rejected) A system comprising:

a device comprising interface means, the interface means for providing a plurality of operations to be selected by a user;

monitoring means for monitoring data of selecting of the plurality of operations of the interface means by the user, and for generating a log of the monitored data, the log of the monitored data being stored in the device, and to automatically start the monitoring without requiring a connection to a receiving device to which the log of monitored data is to be sent, the log of the monitored data being in a form of an abstract class;

communicating means for receiving an object derived from the abstract class including the log of the monitored data, and for automatically communicating the log

of the monitored data by a unidirectional communication without requiring input from the device to which the log of the monitored data is to be sent.

10. (Canceled).

11. (Rejected) A system according to Claim 9, wherein the device is an image forming device and the interface means is an operation panel of the image forming device.

12. (Rejected) A system according to Claim 9, wherein the device is an appliance and the interface means is an operation panel of the appliance.

13. (Rejected) A system according to Claim 9, wherein the communicating means sends the log of the monitored data when the user exits the target device.

14. (Rejected) A system according to Claim 9, further comprising a setting means for setting a number of sessions of the device to be executed by the user prior to the communicating means communicating the log of the monitored data.

15. (Rejected) A system according to Claim 14, wherein the abstract class includes first and second derived classes, the first derived class storing data of one session and the second derived class storing data of the set number of sessions.

16. (Rejected) A system according to any one of Claims 9 and 11-15, wherein the communicating means communicates the log of the monitored data by Internet mail.

17. (Rejected) A method of monitoring usage of an interface of a device, the interface including a plurality of operations to be selected by a user, comprising the steps of:

monitoring data of selecting of the plurality of operations of the interface by the user;

generating a log of the monitored data, the log of the monitored data being stored in the device, and to automatically start the monitoring without requiring a connection to a receiving device to which the log of monitored data is to be sent, the log of the monitored data being in a form of an abstract class; and

receiving an object derived from the abstract class including the log of the monitored data, and automatically communicating the log of the monitored data by a unidirectional communication without requiring input from the device to which the log of the monitored data is to be sent.

18. (Canceled).

19. (Rejected) A method according to Claim 17, wherein the device is an image forming device and the interface is an operation panel of the image forming device.



20. (Rejected) A method according to Claim 17, wherein the device is an appliance and the interface is an operation panel of the appliance.

21. (Rejected) A method according to Claim 17, wherein the communicating step sends the log of the monitored data when the user exits the device.

22. (Rejected) A method according to Claim 17, further comprising a step of setting a number of sessions of the device to be executed by the user prior to the communicating device communicating the log of the monitored data.

23. (Rejected) A system according to Claim 22, wherein the abstract class includes first and second derived classes, the first derived class storing data of one session and the second derived class storing data of the set number of sessions.

24. (Rejected) A method according to any one of Claims 17 and 19-23, wherein the communicating step communicates the log of the monitored data by Internet mail.

25. (Rejected) A computer program product comprising:  
a computer storage medium and a computer program code mechanism embedded in the computer storage medium for causing a computer to monitor a user's usage of an interface of a device, the interface comprising a plurality of operations to be selected by a user, comprising:

a first computer code device configured to monitor data of selecting of the plurality of operations of the interface by the user, and configured to generate a log of

the monitored data, the log of the monitored data being stored in the device, and to automatically start the monitoring without requiring a connection to a receiving device to which the log of monitored data is to be sent, the log of the monitored data being in a form of an abstract class; and

a second computer code device configured to receive an object derived from the abstract class including the log of the monitored data, and to automatically communicate the log of the monitored data by a unidirectional communication without requiring input from the device to which the log of the monitored data is to be sent.

26. (Canceled).

27. (Rejected) A computer program product according to Claim 25, wherein the device is an image forming device and the interface is an operation panel of the image forming device.

28. (Rejected) A computer program product according to Claim 25, wherein the device is an appliance and the interface is an operation panel of the appliance.

29. (Rejected) A computer program product according to Claim 25, wherein the second computer code device is further configured to send the log of the monitored data when the user exits the device.

30. (Rejected) A computer program product according to Claim 25, further comprising a third computer code device configured to set a number of sessions of the

device to be executed by the user prior to the second computer code device communicating the log of the monitored data.

31. (Rejected) A computer program product according to Claim 30, wherein the abstract class includes first and second derived classes, the first derived class storing data of one session and the second derived class storing data of the set number of sessions.

32. (Rejected) A computer program product according to any one of Claims 25 and 27-31, wherein the second computer code device is further configured to communicate the log of the monitored data by Internet mail.